

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,852	03/08/2001	Shu-Jen David Chiang	ON0163NP	6300
23914 7	590 09/10/2002			
STEPHEN B. DAVIS			EXAMINER	
BRISTOL-MY PATENT DEP	ERS SQUIBB COMPAN ARTMENT	IY	SLOBODYANSKY, ELIZABETH	
P O BOX 4000				
PRINCETON,	NJ 08543-4000		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
			DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002 10	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/801,852	CHIANG				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Elizabeth Slobodyansky	1652				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for R ply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2001 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.9. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other: .						

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-13 are pending.

Drawings

The drawings filed concurrently with the application on March 8, 2001 have been approved by Draftsman.

Claim Objections

Claims 7-13 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 7-13 depend from claim 1 and are drawn to "method" whereas claim 1 is drawn to "process". Further, in claim 11, "SEQ. ID. NO.:" is typed instead of "SEQ ID NO:".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as

to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

It is apparent that the plasmids pSJC62.3 and pBMesterase11 are required to practice the claimed invention. As a required element it/they must be known and readily available to the public or obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification. If it/they is/are not so obtainable or available, the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, may be satisfied by a deposit of the microorganism(s). See 37 C.F.R. § 1.802.

The specification does not provide a repeatable process for obtaining the plasmids using essential elements not described in the specification, for example, pSJC62 and pCSN43 (page 30, line 24, and page 31, lines 10-11, respectively). It is not apparent if the microorganism(s) is/are readily available to the public. The specification must contain the date that the microorganism(s) was/were deposited, the name of the microorganism(s) and the address of where the microorganism(s) was/were deposited.

If the deposit(s) <u>has/have</u> been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his/her signature, and registration number, stating that the specific strain(s) has/have been deposited under the Budapest Treaty <u>and</u> that <u>all</u> restrictions imposed

by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.808.

If the deposit(s) has/have <u>not</u> been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit(s) meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.801-1.809, Applicant(s) may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an Attorney of record over his/her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b) <u>all</u> restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit(s) will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer;
- (d) a viability statement in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.807; and
- (e) the deposit will be replaced should it become necessary due to inviability, contamination or loss of capability to function in the manner described in the specification.

In addition, the identifying information set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.809 (d) should be added to the specification. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.803-1.809 for additional explanation of these requirements.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-6 limit the chemical breakdown of cephalosporin C to 40%, 30%, 20%, 10% and 5%, respectively. However, the degree of breakdown depends on temperature, pH, time, etc. Without knowing said conditions, the claims are deemed to be indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/801,852

Art Unit: 1652

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Politino et al.

Politino et al. (WO 98/12345, form PTO-1449 filed January 14, 2002, reference AM) teach a method for producing a recombinant cephalosporin esterase from *Rhodosporidium toruloides* by culturing cells of *Cephalosporin acremonium* transformed with a DNA encoding said esterase (for example, claims 26-28). *Cephalosporin acremonium* is a former name of *Acremonium chrysogenum* (specification, page 1, line 16). They teach that cephalosporin C is completely hydrolyzed within 30 min at 30° C (page 16, lines 25-26). This method is inherently a method for the direct production of desacetylcephalosporin C because *Acremonium chrysogenum* contains nucleic acid encoding enzymes for cephalosporin C biosynthesis and is producing cephalosporin C. A DNA encoding cephalosporin esterase from *Rhodosporidium toruloides* is 100% identical to SEQ ID NO:3 and differs by one nucleotide from SEQ ID NO:1.

Application/Control Number: 09/801,852 Page 7

Art Unit: 1652

Claims 1-6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Politino et al.

Politino et al. (US Patent 5,869,309, form PTO-1449 filed June 14, 2001, reference AG) is US counterpart of WO 98/12345, *supra*. They teach a method for producing a recombinant cephalosporin esterase from *Rhodosporidium toruloides* by culturing cells of *Cephalosporin acremonium* transformed with a DNA encoding said esterase (for example, claims 17-24). They teach that cephalosporin C is completely hydrolyzed within 30 min at 30° C (column 10, lines 11-14). This method is inherently a method for the direct production of desacetylcephalosporin C because *Acremonium chrysogenum* contains nucleic acid encoding enzymes for cephalosporin C biosynthesis and is producing cephalosporin C. A DNA encoding cephalosporin esterase from *Rhodosporidium toruloides* (SEQ ID NOs: 1 or 3) is 100% identical to SEQ ID NOs: 1 or 3, respectively, of the instant invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Politino et al. alone or in view of Smith et al.

The teachings of Politino et al. are outlined above.

Smith et al. (US Patent 4,533,632, form PTO-1449 filed June 14, 2001, reference AC) teach a process for the preparation of desacetylcephalosporin C by fermenting *Acremonium chrysogenum* in the presence of esterase from *Rhodosporidium toruloides* (claims 1-7). The process of fermentation is carried out at 15°-45° C and pH 4-9.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use optimal conditions for fermenting *Acremonium* chrysogenum. Since the species is known, the conditions are known in the art and are recited by Smith et al., for example.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Slobodyansky whose telephone number is (703) 306-3222. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, can be reached at (703) 308-3804. The FAX phone number for Technology Center 1600 is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD